

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 091

RC 016 766

AUTHOR Ghelfi, Linda M.
TITLE The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA): Implications for Welfare-to-Work Proposals.
PUB DATE 2 Feb 88
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Rural Sociological Association (85th, New Orleans, LA, January 31-February 3, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Vocational Education; *Employment Potential; *Federal Programs; *Job Training; *Participant Characteristics; *Rural Urban Differences; *Welfare Recipients; Welfare Services
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982 Title IIA; Reform Efforts; United States (South)

ABSTRACT

The extent to which the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) has been successful in preparing welfare recipients for employment may indicate the level of success to be expected from more comprehensive "welfare to work" programs now under Congressional consideration. In program year 1984, there were 542,000 adult JTPA-IIA participants; of these, 71% were terminees, i.e., persons who finished a program. Welfare recipients comprised 31% of participants and 29% for terminees overall, 18% of terminees in southern states, and less than 25% of terminees in states with nonmetropolitan or mixed populations. Program completion by welfare recipients was 66-72% regardless of state classification. Welfare terminees had more education than welfare recipients in general, but, otherwise, welfare terminees reflected the characteristics of welfare recipients in their states. Compared to nonwelfare terminees, welfare terminees were more likely to be female, black, or single heads of families with children. The overall percentage of terminees who found unsubsidized jobs was 72% for the nonwelfare group and 57% for welfare recipients. Terminees in Southern and nonmetro states were as likely to get jobs as those in other states, and the difference in job placement rates between the two groups did not vary much among states. An analysis of JTPA results, estimated job availability, and total welfare statistics suggests that, under proposed welfare reform programs, there would be 3 welfare-recipient job seekers and 9-11 total job seekers for every available relevant job. The report includes 25 references and 7 data tables. (SV)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED299091



The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA):
Implications for Welfare-to-Work Proposals

Linda M. Ghelfi
Agriculture and Rural Economy Division
Economic Research Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Paper presented at the
Southern Rural Sociological Association
Annual Meetings
New Orleans, Louisiana
February 2, 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

LINDA M.
GHELFI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

RC 016766

INTRODUCTION

We have again entered a period of debate over welfare reform. During the Nixon and Carter Administrations, the Family Assistance Program and the Program for Better Jobs and Income (respectively) were debated, but not enacted. This time there are many proposals from both Democrats and Republicans, and an apparent determination on both sides to enact reform. The element common to both Parties' proposals is the desire to reduce welfare dependency by moving recipients off Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) into private-sector employment.

Reform proposals, including the Family Welfare Reform Act of 1987 passed by the House of Representatives in December (Knudsen, 1987), generally require most adult AFDC recipients to look for work or face loss or reduction in benefits. Disabled adults and those caring for children under 3 years old would be exempted under most proposed programs. Increasing job readiness through facilitating services such as basic education, job training, and job placement assistance is also a central objective of most proposals.

Whether any welfare-to-work program would succeed in placing many welfare recipients in jobs largely depends on its ability to prepare welfare recipients for work and on the availability of and competition for jobs in local labor markets. Competition derives from the number of jobs available relative to the number of people looking for work.

The current Federally-funded training program for the economically disadvantaged is Title II-A of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Welfare-to-work proposals generally mandate coordination of training efforts with JTPA. JTPA currently serves a small proportion of welfare

recipients and provides an example of the potential of job-training programs to assist welfare recipients find private-sector employment.

JTPA was enacted in 1982 to replace the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). Title II-A of JTPA serves economically disadvantaged adults and youth through education, job training, job placement, and other employment-facilitating services. Private industry councils (PICs) are involved with local governments in the design and administration of programs in service delivery areas. The intent is to maximize the probability of success by involving people directly responsible for local private-sector employment in the training process.

This paper examines welfare recipient participation in JTPA to estimate what level of success might be expected from the more comprehensive "welfare-to-work" programs under consideration. The following analysis of welfare recipients' participation in JTPA is divided into three parts. First, background for the analysis is laid by briefly reviewing Federal initiatives in job training programs and employment incentives for welfare recipients. Next, the characteristics of welfare recipients who participated in JTPA in program year 1984 are described. Lastly, the JTPA results and estimated job availability are combined to roughly estimate the potential for placing significantly larger numbers of AFDC recipients in private-sector jobs.

In all sections of the paper, data are analyzed by region and type of State. Region is defined as the South and the Nonsouth. States are also disaggregated by the percentages of their populations that live in nonmetro counties. The South and nonmetro areas are of particular interest because they have higher incidences of poverty than other areas of the country (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1983a). Nonmetro areas also

have poor populations that are geographically isolated and may be hard to serve (Deavers, Hoppe, and Ross). The propensity for JTPA-assisted welfare recipients to get jobs in these States compared to those in nonsouthern and more metropolitan States will be examined.

THE EVOLUTION OF TRAINING AND WORK INCENTIVES PROGRAMS

Over the last 25 years or so there have been parallel developments in Federally-funded welfare and job training programs. As women with children have entered the labor force in ever increasing numbers, it is no longer thought necessary that welfare mothers stay at home with their children. Between 1961 and 1967, the AFDC program was amended to provide social services to help recipients become capable of self-support, establish the Unemployed Parent program to assist two-parent families, create an earned income disregard to encourage work by reducing benefits by less than the total amount of earnings, and develop the Work Incentives (WIN) Program to require able recipients to look for work (Levitan, Mangum, and Marshall, 1976a; Dickinson). These changes initiated paid work as a goal for AFDC recipients.

Until 1971, WIN focused on improving the human capital of AFDC recipients through general education, training, and social services. Amendments in 1971, changed WIN to emphasize job search, job placement, on-the-job training, public service employment, and work experience (Dickinson, p. 267). The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 permitted States to design demonstration projects administered solely by State welfare agencies as an alternative to WIN. Community Work Experience Programs (CWEPs) were also authorized to allow States to

require AFDC recipients to work in return for their benefits. Not all States have instituted WIN demonstrations or CWEPs. By 1985, 22 States were operating WIN demonstrations, and 23 States had implemented work experience programs in at least part of the State (U.S. House of Representatives, pp. 332, 335).

As changing philosophies regarding work by welfare recipients changed AFDC, so did varying views of unemployment change employment and training programs. The causes of unemployment have been viewed from three differing perspectives. Some believe unemployment has been caused by the displacement of workers by automation. Others believe people are not in the right places or do not have appropriate skills for the jobs that are available. And, others believe that job growth is insufficient to employ all those wanting to work. Over the years, training programs have been tailored to address unemployment from each of these perspectives (Levitan, Mangum, and Marshall, 1976b).

The Area Redevelopment Act was enacted in 1961 to attract new industry to depressed areas, thereby moving jobs to the right places for the unemployed. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 addressed unemployment by training people for employment. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 established Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps centers. Job Corps centers provide a residential training program for youths from environments not conducive to learning. A Work Experience and Training Program was also instituted to allow welfare recipients to work for their benefits. And, Community Action Programs, for the first time, joined public and private antipoverty agencies and representatives of the poor in an effort to coordinate programs (Levitan, Mangum, and Marshall, 1976b).

The Concentrated Employment Program enacted in 1967 again directed efforts to the poorest places, but added the specific effort to convince private employers to hire the poor. In 1973, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act brought the plethora of Federally-funded employment and training programs under a single program. CETA transferred most responsibilities to State and local governments in conjunction with nonprofit community-based organizations (Levitan, Mangum, and Marshall, 1976b). The Federal role became that of oversight and compliance. The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) enacted in 1982 addressed the failure of CETA to include private business in training activities (Nilsen and Fratoe).

Guttman sees these continual changes as caused by the diverse objectives that have been sought through training programs:

They have, at various times, been designed to retrain the experienced labor force, to remedy the adverse effects of automation, to relieve poverty, to create jobs, to serve as a backstop for income maintenance programs, to encourage high school completion, to reduce juvenile delinquency, to convert welfare recipients into wage earners, and to conserve natural resources. Virtually all worthwhile social goals have at some time been an objective of manpower policy (Guttman, p. 3).

The current JTPA program is designed to serve several groups of people facing employment disadvantages. Title II-A funds are to be used to provide services to economically disadvantaged persons, primarily persons whose family incomes, excluding unemployment compensation, welfare benefits, and child support, are below the Federal poverty level. Up to 10 percent of participants may not be economically disadvantaged if they have encountered employment barriers (e.g. those with limited English proficiency, displaced homemakers, school dropouts, teenage parents, and handicapped persons). AFDC recipients and school

dropouts must be served equal to their representation in the economically disadvantaged population.

Title III provides funds to States for retraining and placing dislocated workers in new fields. And, Title IV covers Federally administered programs for Native Americans, migrant and seasonal farm workers, and veterans; the Job Corps; and the National Commission for Employment Policy.

With the emphasis of AFDC work programs changing to workfare, JTPA has become the main vehicle for public training programs. Since Title II-A training programs place special emphasis on the economically disadvantaged, and AFDC recipients in particular, an examination of JTPA participation provides useful information for assessing the ability of training programs to help welfare recipients get private-sector jobs.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Data Sources

Data on JTPA participants by state was aggregated from the 1984 program year (July 1, 1984 through June 30, 1985) JTPA Annual Status Reports filed by service delivery areas with the U.S. Department of Labor. Data on the economically disadvantaged are reported for both adults (22 years old and older) and youth (14 to 21 years old), but since this paper focuses on adult welfare recipients, only adult JTPA participants are analyzed. The welfare reciprocity status of all participants is reported and the sex, age, educational status, family status, race/ethnicity, ability to speak English, disability, and

unsubsidized job placement of persons completing a JTPA program are also given.

These administrative data were supplemented with the following state socioeconomic data from other sources:

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Source</u>
Number unemployed Number in the civilian labor force Unemployment rate	Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1984
Number employed	Bureau of Economic Analysis, 1984
Adult AFDC recipients	Dept. of Health and Human Services, February, 1985

Since the 1984 JTPA program year ran from July 1, 1984 through June 30, 1985, it does not match employment and unemployment data reported on a calendar year basis. Employment and unemployment data for calendar year 1984 were selected for analysis because they represent the economic situation at the beginning of the program year. Policy decisions such as which occupations to train participants for would more likely have been based on the 1984 employment situation than on the expected 1985 situation. February, 1985 data on the number of AFDC adults was chosen because the count occurred during the program year.

Definitions

Terminees are persons who completed a JTPA program.

South is the Census Bureau defined region including Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Metropolitan areas are comprised of counties containing a city of 50,000 or more population or counties containing urbanized areas of at least 50,000 with an area population of at least 100,000. Additional contiguous counties are included if they are economically and socially integrated with the central city/urbanized area. This is the metro designation as of the 1980 Census of Population (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1983b).

Nonmetropolitan areas are counties which are not metropolitan.

Type of State States were ranked by the percentage of their population living in nonmetro counties. Breaks occurred in this distribution between 24.4 percent and 28.9 percent and again between 45.3 percent and 50.5 percent. Using these break points, three groups of States were identified as metro, mixed, and nonmetro.

Metro states have less than 25 percent of their population living in nonmetro counties. They are Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

Mixed states have 28 to 45 percent of their population living in nonmetro counties. They are Alabama, Delaware, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Nonmetro states have 50 percent or more of their population living in nonmetro counties. They are Alaska, Arkansas, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska,

New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Procedures

Variables used in this analysis are generally straightforward interval scale or categorical variables. Several ratios were constructed to compare JTPA welfare recipient terminees with other terminees. The analysis is in three parts. The first describes JTPA terminees by welfare status, region, and type of state. Second, emphasis on training welfare recipients is investigated by comparing welfare participants to the total number of AFDC recipients. Finally, JTPA program completion rates are combined with employment and unemployment data to estimate the success welfare reform programs might expect in placing AFDC adults in private-sector jobs.

ADULT WELFARE RECIPIENTS IN JTPA

In program year 1984, there were 542,000 adult JTPA participants (Table 1). Of these participants, 387,000 (71 percent) finished a program. Welfare recipients comprised 166,000 (31 percent) of the participants and 113,000 (29 percent) of the terminees.

Welfare recipients comprised a lower percentage of participants in the southern States than in the other States. Only 18 percent of southern terminees were welfare recipients compared with 35 percent of terminees in the Northern and Western States. This difference may be explained by the larger percentage of the economically disadvantaged in southern States that are not welfare recipients due to the exclusion of

Table 1. Adult JTPA Title II-A Participants and Terminees
by Welfare Status, Region, and Type of State, 1984

	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Terminees</u>	<u>Percent Terminees</u>
Total adults	541,932	386,973	71.4
Welfare recipients	165,825	113,371	68.4
as percent of adults	30.6	29.3	
By region:			
South	182,114	131,702	72.3
Welfare recipients	34,140	24,209	70.9
as percent of adults	18.7	18.4	
Nonsouth	359,818	255,271	70.9
Welfare recipients	131,685	89,162	67.7
as percent of adults	36.6	34.9	
By type of state:			
Nonmetro	66,385	46,741	70.4
Welfare recipients	14,995	10,032	66.9
as percent of adults	22.6	21.5	
Mixed	151,221	108,701	71.9
Welfare recipients	36,523	25,011	68.5
as percent of adults	24.2	23.0	
Metro	324,326	231,531	71.4
Welfare recipients	114,307	78,328	68.5
as percent of adults	35.2	33.8	

NOTE: Percents of JTPA welfare recipients who completed a program are shown by State in Appendix Table 1.

Source: Computed using data from JTPA Annual Status Reports, 1984 program year.

two-parent families from AFDC in most southern States. One-third of metro States' terminees were welfare recipients compared with less than one-quarter of mixed and nonmetro States' terminees. Interestingly, regardless of how States were classified or what percentage of their JTPA participants were welfare recipients, each group of States obtained between 66 and 72 percent program completion among welfare recipients.

Characteristics of welfare recipient terminees differed by type of State (Table 2). Due to the exclusion from AFDC of two-parent families in most southern States, most southern adult welfare recipients are women. This is reflected in the regional difference in percent female; 90 percent of southern welfare recipient terminees were female, compared with 62 percent in the other States. The lower educational attainment in the South is also reflected in the 36 percent of southern welfare recipients who had not completed high school compared with the 29 percent in the other States. However, it appears that the group of JTPA welfare terminees have higher educational attainment than all welfare recipients. Only about half of householders of families receiving public assistance in 1986 had completed high school, compared with nearly 70 percent of JTPA welfare terminees. The average education of householders receiving AFDC was 10.6 years in 1986 (Bloomquist, Jensen, and Teixeira). JTPA welfare terminees average at least a high school education.

The concentration of poor blacks in the South and central cities is reflected in the higher percentages of black terminees in the South and in mixed and metro States. The concentrations of Hispanics in central cities and of American Indians in rural areas are also reflected in the

Table 2. Characteristics of Adult JTPA Terminees by Welfare Status, Region, and Type of State

	<u>Total</u>	<u>By Region:</u>		<u>By Type of State:</u>		
		<u>South</u>	<u>Nonsouth</u>	<u>Nonmetro</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Netro</u>
		--- Number ---				
Welfare Recipient Terminees	113,371	24,209	89,162	10,032	25,011	78,328
Percent:		--- Percent ---				
Female	67.8	89.5	62.0	76.2	76.5	64.0
Single parent with children	54.2	82.1	46.6	65.5	63.2	49.8
High school dropout	30.2	35.7	28.7	27.8	31.9	29.9
Minority	50.0	70.4	44.3	35.9	47.7	52.3
Black, not Hispanic	37.4	64.2	30.1	23.6	42.0	37.6
Hispanic	8.8	4.5	9.9	5.5	1.7	11.4
American Indian	1.6	.6	1.8	5.3	1.8	1.0
Asian	2.2	1.1	2.5	1.5	2.2	2.3
Limited english ability	3.4	2.0	3.8	2.3	2.6	3.8
Disabled	6.1	4.0	6.7	6.4	6.0	6.1
Obtained unsubsidized job	57.3	59.6	56.7	58.0	59.9	56.3
		--- Number ---				
Other Terminees	273,602	107,493	166,109	36,709	83,690	153,203
Percent:		--- Percent ---				
Female	44.8	48.5	42.4	45.6	46.4	43.7
Single parent with children	17.4	21.8	14.6	16.6	17.5	17.6
High school dropout	24.2	29.6	21.0	25.2	26.8	22.6
Minority	41.2	48.8	36.2	26.4	34.3	48.6
Black, not Hispanic	27.7	40.0	19.7	19.5	30.9	27.9
Hispanic	9.7	7.4	11.1	3.6	1.3	15.7
American Indian	1.2	.6	1.6	2.6	1.1	1.0
Asian	2.6	.8	3.8	.7	1.0	4.0
Limited english ability	4.2	2.8	5.1	1.1	1.3	6.5
Disabled	9.0	8.2	9.5	9.7	9.0	8.6
Obtained unsubsidized job	72.3	72.4	72.3	70.4	75.5	71.1

NOTE: Percents of JTPA welfare recipient terminees who obtained unsubsidized jobs are shown by State in Appendix Table 2.

Source: Computed using data from JTPA Annual Status Reports, 1984 program year.

higher percentage of metro terminees who are Hispanic and the higher percentage of nonmetro terminees who are American Indians.

The other (nonwelfare) terminees differ from welfare recipient terminees in several respects. A much lower percentage of other terminees are women or single heads of families with children. Blacks comprise a smaller percentage of other terminees than of welfare recipient terminees while the other minorities generally comprise about the same percentages of other and welfare recipient terminees.

The percentage of terminees who found unsubsidized jobs is the most telling characteristic for welfare-to-work discussions. A much lower percentage of welfare recipient terminees found jobs. The differences ranged from 12.4 percentage points in nonmetro areas to 15.6 percentage points outside the South and in mixed States. Overall, 57 percent of welfare recipient terminees found employment compared with 72 percent of other terminees. Since higher percentages of welfare terminees had not completed high school, were single parents with children, or were black, they may face more difficulties in obtaining employment than other terminees. What is heartening about the employment percentages is that terminees in southern States and nonmetro States were as likely to get unsubsidized jobs as those in other types of States. But how do the numbers of welfare recipients currently being trained and getting jobs compare with the number of adult AFDC recipients who may be asked to train and seek employment by welfare-to-work programs?

JTPA WELFARE PARTICIPANTS COMPARED WITH AFDC ADULTS

JTPA welfare participants are not necessarily all AFDC recipients. However, comparing their number to the number of adult AFDC recipients shows the relative size of the pool being trained. As shown in Table 3, there were only 4.6 JTPA welfare participants for each 100 AFDC adults. This ratio decreases to 3.1 per 100 for program terminees and 1.8 per 100 for placements in unsubsidized jobs. Neither by region nor by type of state do these ratios vary greatly. The mandate to serve AFDC recipients in relationship to their percentage of the disadvantaged may account for the lack of variation.

The number of welfare recipients who participated in JTPA is very small compared to the number of AFDC recipients that could be required to participate in training and job search under proposed welfare reform programs. In serving a very small proportion of welfare recipients, only about half of those who finished a program got unsubsidized jobs. Will training and job-search programs for many more welfare recipients result in private-sector jobs?

THE LIKELIHOOD OF PLACING AFDC RECIPIENTS IN PRIVATE-SECTOR JOBS

To estimate the likelihood of placing larger numbers of AFDC recipients in unsubsidized jobs, JTPA program completion rates were applied to the AFDC adult population expected to be required to work. These job seekers were then compared to an estimate of the number of jobs they qualify for and the number of unemployed persons who might be competing for the same jobs.

Table 3. Ratio of JTPA Welfare Recipient Participants, Terminees, and Unsubsidized Job Placements to AFDC Adults

	Total	By region:		By Type of State:		
		<u>South</u>	<u>Nonsouth</u>	<u>Nonmetro</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Metro</u>
Number of AFDC Adults	3,606,432	838,102	2,768,330	318,998	728,216	2,559,218
For every 100 AFDC Adults there are:						
JTPA participants	4.6	4.1	4.8	4.7	5.0	4.5
terminees	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.1	3.4	3.1
unsubsidized job placements	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.8	2.1	1.7

NOTE: Ratios of JTPA welfare recipient participants to adult AFDC recipients are shown by State in Appendix Table 3.

Source: AFDC adults - U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Social Security Administration, Office of Policy, Office of Family Assistance, Public Assistance Recipients in Metropolitan Statistical Areas, February, 1984, and February, 1985, SSA Pub. No. 13-11921, December, 1985.
JTPA Welfare Recipients - JTPA Annual Status Reports, 1984 program year.

There were 3.6 million adult AFDC recipients in February, 1985 (Table 4). After excluding those who are estimated to be exempt from seeking employment or training (i.e. those caring for children under 3 years old, the sick, disabled, or elderly, those already working full-time or attending school, and the second adult in two-parent families), an estimated 2 million participants were left.^{1/} Applying the JTPA program completion rate in each State to the number of estimated participants in each State, and aggregating to the National level yielded 1.4 million who would be looking for work.^{2/}

Of the 100 million jobs in 1984, 31 million were estimated as requiring the level of education these job seekers possess. However, only the vacant jobs in this pool would be available. Using the 1.4 percent vacancy rate developed by Bloomquist, Jensen, and Teixeira (1987) based on Abraham's (1983) work, resulted in an estimate of 432,000 vacancies. This means that there would be about three times as many AFDC recipients seeking jobs as there are available jobs they would

^{1/}The estimation of those who would be eligible was done in two steps. First, 7.7 percent were subtracted because they were estimated to be second adults in two-parent families. This percentage was based on data from the 1977 AFDC Recipient Characteristics Study. Second, 40 percent of the remainder were subtracted because they were estimated to meet one of the other exclusions. This percentage is based on Bloomquist, Jensen, and Teixeira's analysis of heads of families receiving AFDC. The family heads may not be the adult AFDC recipients (for example, a woman with a child who lives with her parents is the adult AFDC recipient, but her father or mother would be the family head). Therefore, the family head characteristics may be somewhat different from the characteristics of adult AFDC recipients, making the estimate of exemptions less accurate. However, this percentage was the only available estimate of exclusions at the time of this analysis.

^{2/}Program completion rates by State are shown in Appendix Table 1.

Table 4. Estimated AFDC Adult Training and Job Availability, 1984

		By Region:		By Type of State:		
	Total	South	Nonsouth	Nonmetro	Mixed	Metro
<u>AFDC Adults, Training, and Jobs</u>						
Adult AFDC recipients	3,606,432	838,102	2,768,330	318,998	728,216	2,559,218
Estimated number not required to seek employment <u>1/</u>	-1,609,190	-373,961	-1,235,229	-142,337	-324,930	-1,141,923
Estimated participants	1,997,242	464,141	1,533,101	176,661	403,286	1,417,295
Number who would complete a training program <u>2/</u>	1,381,304	328,519	1,052,785	117,788	280,930	982,587
Total employment	99,941,000	33,646,550	66,294,450	9,290,300	25,765,452	64,885,248
Estimated number of jobs compatible with average welfare recipient education <u>3/</u>	30,881,769	10,396,784	20,484,985	2,870,703	7,961,525	20,049,542
Vacancies <u>4/</u>	432,345	145,555	286,790	40,190	111,461	280,694
Ratio of trained AFDC recipients to vacancies	3.2 to 1	2.3 to 1	3.7 to 1	2.9 to 1	2.5 to 1	3.5 to 1
Total unemployed	8,537,439	2,753,854	5,783,585	914,023	2,193,029	5,430,387
Estimated number with education comparable to AFDC recipient education <u>5/</u>	2,971,029	958,341	2,012,688	318,080	763,174	1,889,775
Ratio of trained AFDC recipients and comparable unemployed to vacant jobs	10.1 to 1	8.8 to 1	10.7 to 1	10.8 to 1	9.4 to 1	10.2 to 1

Notes for Table 4

1/ Data from the 1977 AFDC Recipient Characteristics Study was used to estimate that 7.7 percent of adult AFDC recipients would be exempt because they are the second adults in two-parent families. Bloomquist, Jensen, and Teixeira (1987) estimated that 40 percent of AFDC householders would be exempt due to having a child under 3, being employed full-time, full-year, being ill, disabled, or in school, or being 65 years old or older. These percentages were applied consecutively to the number of adult AFDC recipients to obtain the number not required to participate.

2/ Number of participants who would finish a training program is estimated using the percentage by State of JTPA welfare participants who completed a program.

3/ Bloomquist, Jensen, and Teixeira estimated that 30.9 percent of jobs are held by people with education comparable to that of welfare recipients. This percentage was applied to total employment to obtain the estimated number of jobs compatible with average welfare recipient education.

4/ A vacancy rate of 1.4 percent of employment was used. This vacancy rate was calculated by Bloomquist, Jensen, and Teixeira, based on Abraham's data.

5/ Bloomquist, Jensen, and Teixeira estimated that 34.8 percent of the unemployed have education comparable to that of welfare recipients. This percentage was applied to total unemployment to obtain the estimated number of unemployed people who would be competing for the same jobs as welfare recipients.

Sources: Data are from sources shown in the Data and Methodology section, page 7.

be qualified to do. Adding the estimated number of the unemployed who would be competing for the same jobs brings the number of job seekers to 10 for every vacancy.

Although the estimates of AFDC job seekers per vacancy vary by region and type of State (lowest ratios in the South and mixed States to highest ratios in the nonsouth and metro States), in no area does there appear to be as many jobs as seekers. And, when the unemployed are added, all areas have 9 to 11 job seekers per vacancy.

CONCLUSIONS

In 1984, a small number of welfare recipients were being trained through JTPA and finding unsubsidized employment. The job placement rate for welfare recipients was not as high as for other program terminees, but this may stem from the higher percentage of welfare terminees who face employment difficulties due to being a single parent, black, or a high school dropout.

The number of welfare recipients who participated in JTPA in 1984 is very small compared to the number of adult AFDC recipients that could be required to participate in training and job search under proposed welfare reform programs. In serving a very small number of welfare recipients, only about half of those who finished a program got unsubsidized jobs. This low placement rate implies that program administrators may find it difficult to place much larger numbers of welfare recipients in private-sector jobs.

JTPA program completion rates and estimates of the numbers of program participants, compatible job vacancies, and unemployed persons competing for the same jobs, were used to estimate the availability of jobs for AFDC adults. The results indicate that there may not be enough jobs for all AFDC adults who would be required to work. The possibility that training could cost a significant amount not compensated by reductions in welfare payments needs to be considered.

Increasing job opportunities is not easily mandated by Federal or State initiatives. In areas where there are more adult AFDC recipients than jobs the most cost effective route may be to gauge opportunities at the local level and train as many AFDC recipients as there are jobs. Private Industry Councils are currently involved in JTPA operations at the service delivery area level to make this coordination possible. The cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments and the PICs might also make it possible to increase local job opportunities or assist trainees to move to places where jobs are available.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, Katherine G. "Structural/Frictional Vs. Deficient Demand
1983 Unemployment: Some New Evidence". American Economic Review
73(4):708-724.
- Bergmann, Barbara R. "A Fresh Start on Welfare Reform". Challenge
1987 30(5):44-50.
- Bloomquist, Leonard E., Leif Jensen, and Ruy A. Teixeira. " 'Workfare'
1987 and Nonmetro America: An Assessment of the Employment
Opportunities for Nonmetro Welfare Clients". Paper presented
at the Ninth Annual Research Conference of the Association
for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Bethesda,
Maryland, October 29-31.
- Cho, Woong K. "Race Differentials in Perceived Employment Barriers in
1986 the Rural South". In Dimensions of Poverty in the Rural
South, J.S. Dhillon and M.R. Howie (eds.), Florida A&M
University, pp. 49-59.
- Cook, Robert F. and Wayne M. Turnage. "The New Federal-State Program
1985 to Train Dislocated Workers". Monthly Labor Review 108(7):32-
35.
- Deavers, Kenneth L., Robert A. Hoppe, and Peggy J. Ross. "Public
1986 Policy and Rural Poverty: A View from the 1980's". Policy
Studies Review 51(2):291-309.
- Devens, Richard M., Jr. "Displaced Workers: One Year Later". Monthly
1986 Labor Review 109(7):40-43.
- Dickinson, Nancy S. "Which Welfare Work Strategies Work?". Social
1986 Work 31(4):266-272.
- Guttman, Robert. "Job Training Partnership Act: New Help for the
1983 Unemployed". Monthly Labor Review 106(3):3-10.
- Hoffman, Saul D. "On-the-job Training: Differences by Race and Sex".
1981 Monthly Labor Review 104(7):34-36.
- Horvath, Francis W. "The Pulse of Economic Change: Displaced Workers
1987 of 1981-85". Monthly Labor Review 110(6):3-12.
- Johnson, Kenny and Marilyn Scurlock. "The Climate for Workers: Where
1986 Does the South Stand?". Southern Changes 8(4-5):3-15.
- Knudsen, Patrick L. "After Long, Bruising Battle, House Approves
1987 Welfare Bill". Congressional Quarterly December 19, pp. 3157-
3165.

- Levitan, Sar A., Garth L. Mangum, and Ray Marshall. "Work and
1976a Welfare". Chapter 15 in Human Resources and Labor Markets,
New York: Harper and Row, pp.321-342.
- 1976b "Lessons from Manpower Programs". Chapter 16 in Human
Resources and Labor Markets, pp.343-362.
- Levitan, Sar A. and Isaac Shapiro. "What's Missing in Welfare
1987 Reform?", Challenge 30(3):41-48.
- Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation. "Fact Sheet: The Job
1986 Training Partnership Act Experiments", MDRC publication,
November.
- National Alliance of Business. What's Happening with JTPA? A Complete
undated Analysis of NAB's 1984 Survey Data, NAB publication.
- National Association of Counties. JTPA Service Delivery Area
1987 Directory, 1987-1988, NAC publication.
- Nilsen, Sigurd R. and Frank A. Fratoe. "Job Training Partnership Act,
1984 CETA, and Rural Communities". Rural Development Perspectives
1(1):34-37.
- Ross, Peggy J. and Stuart A. Rosenfeld. "Human Resource Policies and
1987 Economic Development". Chapter 15 in Rural Economic
Development in the 1980's: Preparing for the Future
Agriculture and Rural Economy Division, Economic Research
Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, ERS Staff Report No.
AGE870724, July, pp. 15 1-15 25.
- Ryscavage, Paul M. "Employment Problems and Poverty: Examining the
1982 Linkages". Monthly Labor Review 105(6):55-59.
- U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1980 Census of
1983a Population, Vol. 1: Characteristics of the Population,
Chapter C: General Social and Economic Characteristics, Part
1: U.S. Summary, PC80-1-C1, December.
- 1983b 1980 Census of Population and Housing: Public Use Microdata
Samples, Technical Documentation, February.
- U. S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means.
1985 Background Material and Data on Programs Within the
Jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Washington,
D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Appendix Table 1. Adult JTPA Welfare Recipient Participants and Terminees by State, 1984

STATE	REGION	TYPE	WELFARE RECIPIENT		PERCENT TERMINEES
			PARTICIPANTS	TERMINEES	
AL	South	Mixed	1,549	1,182	76.3
AK	Other	Nonmet	216	160	74.1
AZ	Other	Metro	1,098	795	72.4
AR	South	Nonmet	945	688	72.8
CA	Other	Metro	14,194	10,948	77.1
CO	Other	Metro	2,400	1,687	70.3
CT	Other	Metro	2,294	1,792	78.1
DE	South	Mixed	491	394	80.2
DC	South	Metro	359	357	99.4
FL	South	Metro	4,523	3,454	76.4
GA	South	Mixed	3,050	2,080	68.2
HI	Other	Metro	497	371	74.6
ID	Other	Nonmet	459	404	88.0
IL	Other	Metro	8,825	4,797	54.4
IN	Other	Mixed	2,747	1,626	59.2
IA	Other	Nonmet	2,089	1,271	60.8
KS	Other	Nonmet	1,334	827	62.0
KY	South	Nonmet	1,752	1,180	67.4
LA	South	Mixed	1,268	874	68.9
ME	Other	Nonmet	809	527	65.1
MD	South	Metro	3,399	2,408	70.8
MA	Other	Metro	3,586	2,612	72.8
MI	Other	Metro	16,598	11,316	68.2
MN	Other	Mixed	5,533	3,124	56.5
MS	South	Nonmet	1,404	998	71.1
MO	Other	Mixed	2,152	1,666	77.4
MT	Other	Nonmet	854	635	74.4
NE	Other	Nonmet	642	406	63.2
NV	Other	Metro	124	80	64.5
NH	Other	Mixed	329	188	57.1
NJ	Other	Metro	3,520	2,225	63.2
NM	Other	Nonmet	1,310	781	59.6
NY	Other	Metro	18,154	13,947	76.8
NC	South	Mixed	2,484	1,569	63.2
ND	Other	Nonmet	375	219	58.4
OH	Other	Metro	17,246	10,394	60.3
OK	South	Mixed	1,118	772	69.1
OR	Other	Mixed	1,634	1,353	82.8
PA	Other	Metro	8,469	4,978	58.8
RI	Other	Metro	608	448	73.7
SC	South	Mixed	1,374	1,005	73.1
SD	Other	Nonmet	212	142	67.0
TN	South	Mixed	1,681	1,228	73.1
TX	South	Metro	4,187	2,760	65.9
UT	Other	Metro	1,103	723	65.5
VT	Other	Nonmet	782	636	81.3
VA	South	Mixed	2,976	2,233	75.0
WA	Other	Metro	3,123	2,236	71.6
WV	South	Nonmet	1,580	1,027	65.0
WI	Other	Mixed	8,137	5,717	70.3
WY	Other	Nonmet	232	131	56.5

Appendix Table 2. JTPA Welfare Recipient Terminees and Unsubsidized Job Placements by State, 1984

STATE	REGION	TYPE	WELFARE RECIPIENT		PERCENT WHO OBTAINED JOBS
			TERMINEES	OBTAINED UNSUBSIDIZED JOBS	
AL	South	Mixed	1,182	866	73.3
AK	Other	Nonmet	160	95	59.4
AZ	Other	Metro	795	438	55.1
AR	South	Nonmet	688	426	61.9
CA	Other	Metro	10,948	6,218	56.8
CO	Other	Metro	1,687	1,164	69.0
CT	Other	Metro	1,792	1,042	58.1
DE	South	Mixed	394	217	55.1
DC	South	Metro	357	237	66.4
FL	South	Metro	3,454	2,306	66.8
GA	South	Mixed	2,080	1,058	50.9
HI	Other	Metro	371	230	62.0
ID	Other	Nonmet	404	246	60.9
IL	Other	Metro	4,797	2,459	51.3
IN	Other	Mixed	1,626	1,035	63.7
IA	Other	Nonmet	1,271	740	58.2
KS	Other	Nonmet	827	473	57.2
KY	South	Nonmet	1,180	534	45.3
LA	South	Mixed	874	539	61.7
ME	Other	Nonmet	527	382	72.5
MD	South	Metro	2,408	1,519	63.1
MA	Other	Metro	2,612	1,532	58.7
MI	Other	Metro	11,316	6,843	60.5
MN	Other	Mixed	3,124	1,973	63.2
MS	South	Nonmet	998	638	63.9
MO	Other	Mixed	1,666	1,011	60.7
MT	Other	Nonmet	635	366	57.6
NE	Other	Nonmet	406	221	54.4
NV	Other	Metro	80	44	55.0
NH	Other	Mixed	188	133	70.7
NJ	Other	Metro	2,225	1,437	64.6
NM	Other	Nonmet	781	407	52.1
NY	Other	Metro	13,947	7,483	53.7
NC	South	Mixed	1,569	852	54.3
ND	Other	Nonmet	219	123	56.2
OH	Other	Metro	10,394	4,809	46.3
OK	South	Mixed	772	468	60.6
OR	Other	Mixed	1,353	913	67.5
PA	Other	Metro	4,978	2,860	57.5
RI	Other	Metro	448	249	55.6
SC	South	Mixed	1,005	685	68.2
SD	Other	Nonmet	142	79	55.6
TN	South	Mixed	1,228	703	57.2
TX	South	Metro	2,760	1,558	56.4
UT	Other	Metro	723	431	59.6
VT	Other	Nonmet	636	377	59.3
VA	South	Mixed	2,233	1,205	54.0
WA	Other	Metro	2,236	1,277	57.1
WV	South	Nonmet	1,027	620	60.4
WI	Other	Mixed	5,717	3,330	58.2
WY	Other	Nonmet	131	91	69.5

Appendix Table 3. Ratio of JTPA Welfare Recipient Participants, Terminees, and Unsubsidized Job Placements to Total Adult AFDC Recipients

STATE	REGION	TYPE	AFDC RECIPIENTS	FOR EVERY 100 AFDC RECIPIENTS THERE ARE:		
			IN FEBRUARY, 1985	PARTICIPANTS	TERMINEES	JOB PLACEMENTS
AL	South	Mixed	45,910	3.4	2.6	1.9
AK	Other	Nonmet	5,650	3.8	2.8	1.7
AZ	Other	Metro	21,723	5.1	3.7	2.0
AR	South	Nonmet	19,004	5.0	3.6	2.2
CA	Other	Metro	554,041	2.6	2.0	1.1
CO	Other	Metro	27,960	8.6	6.0	4.2
CT	Other	Metro	40,485	5.7	4.4	2.6
DE	South	Mixed	8,343	5.9	4.7	2.6
DC	South	Metro	15,158	2.4	2.4	1.6
FL	South	Metro	81,132	5.6	4.3	2.8
GA	South	Mixed	73,527	4.1	2.8	1.4
HI	Other	Metro	18,242	2.7	2.0	1.3
ID	Other	Nonmet	6,037	7.6	6.7	4.1
IL	Other	Metro	243,553	3.6	2.0	1.0
IN	Other	Mixed	54,063	5.1	3.0	1.9
IA	Other	Nonmet	45,794	4.6	2.8	1.6
KS	Other	Nonmet	23,375	5.7	3.5	2.0
KY	South	Nonmet	52,934	3.3	2.2	1.0
LA	South	Mixed	67,007	1.9	1.3	.8
ME	Other	Nonmet	22,155	3.7	2.4	1.7
MD	South	Metro	69,703	4.9	3.5	2.2
MA	Other	Metro	82,751	4.3	3.2	1.9
MI	Other	Metro	254,877	6.5	4.4	2.7
MN	Other	Mixed	56,958	9.7	5.5	3.5
MS	South	Nonmet	43,243	3.2	2.3	1.5
MO	Other	Mixed	69,186	3.1	2.4	1.5
MT	Other	Nonmet	7,508	11.4	8.5	4.9
NE	Other	Nonmet	14,902	4.3	2.7	1.5
NV	Other	Metro	4,330	2.9	1.8	1.0
NH	Other	Mixed	5,036	6.5	3.7	2.6
NJ	Other	Metro	120,287	2.9	1.8	1.2
NM	Other	Nonmet	14,406	9.1	5.4	2.8
NY	Other	Metro	383,650	4.7	3.6	2.0
NC	South	Mixed	52,091	4.8	3.0	1.6
ND	Other	Nonmet	4,244	8.8	5.2	2.9
OH	Other	Metro	248,536	6.9	4.2	1.9
OK	South	Mixed	24,852	4.5	3.1	1.9
OR	Other	Mixed	24,709	6.6	5.5	3.7
PA	Other	Metro	192,161	4.4	2.6	1.5
RI	Other	Metro	15,735	3.9	2.8	1.6
SC	South	Mixed	36,485	3.8	2.8	1.9
SD	Other	Nonmet	4,995	4.2	2.8	1.6
TN	South	Mixed	49,492	3.4	2.5	1.4
TX	South	Metro	105,558	4.0	2.6	1.5
UT	Other	Metro	13,731	8.0	5.3	3.1
VT	Other	Nonmet	8,967	8.7	7.1	4.2
VA	South	Mixed	51,301	5.8	4.4	2.3
WA	Other	Metro	65,605	4.8	3.4	1.9
WV	South	Nonmet	42,362	3.7	2.4	1.5
WI	Other	Mixed	109,256	7.4	5.2	3.0
WY	Other	Nonmet	3,422	6.8	3.8	2.7